

Serial No. 10/694,192
Atty. Doc. No. 2000P20254WOUS

REMARKS

Applicants have canceled claims 38 - 40 and 42 - 44 and added new claims 46 - 51. Thus, claims 25 - 37, 41, and 45 - 51 are pending in the application and presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response To Rejections Under Section 103

Claim 37:

Claims 31 - 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims are obvious in view of any Becker (WO 99/47874), Liebe (DE 19751299), Walz et al. (US 6,085,515), and Moore (US 5,326,206).

Claim 37 recites that the guide hole has a narrowing cross section that causes radial and/or axial movement of the housing to be damped. This guide hole arrangement will increase damping by increasing friction between the bolt and housing. The prior art is discussed below and does not teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed invention.

Becker teaches a heat protection element 9 supported by a suspension device 11 (i.e. a bolt having a tapered bolt head) arranged in metal support structure 3 (see e.g. Becker abstract and Figure 1). This cantilevered suspension device 11 cannot physically allow for radial and/or axial movement of the heat protection element. Moreover, the Becker cantilever support will reduce structural damping by the increased component rigidity arising from the suspension device 11, support structure 3, and heat protection element 9 interaction. Thus, if Becker provides any teaching regarding housing damping, it teaches away from damping. Liebe teaches a wall 6 supported by a plurality of bolts 16 attached to a wall structure 3 (see e.g. Liebe abstract and Figure). Like Becker, Liebe teaches a cantilevered support that reduces system damping. Walz teaches a bolt 4 having an end portion 11 that extends through the wall of a supporting structure 1 and supporting an insulating brick 3 (see e.g. Walz specification column 6 lines 30 - 45). Like Becker and Liebe, Walz also teaches a cantilevered support structure 1 that reduces system damping.

Serial No. 10/694,192
Atty. Doc. No. 2000P20254WOUS

Moore teaches a surface panel 12 that is connected to a bracket member 15 by a bolt 11 such that the bracket member 15 has a bolt receiving bore 16 similar to the diameter of the bolt 11, an enlarged recessed bore 17 in a portion of the bracket member 15, and floating nut panels 34 that allow the bolt 11 to pivot (see e.g. Moore specification column 3 line 56 to column 4 line 40). Moreover, Moore teaches away from using a guide hole that has a narrowing cross section for increased structural damping by explaining that the bolt is allowed to pivot by incorporating floating nut panels. Thus, if Moore teaches anything regarding housing damping, it teaches away from using a guide hole that has a narrowing cross section for increased structural damping.

Regarding the remaining claims, Applicant respectfully submits that its prior arguments (see Response to Office Action, dated October 12, 2005) support their patentability.

New Independent Claim 51:

New independent claim 51 further defines the scope of the invention, as described in the specification and drawings. Claim 51 provides additional detail regarding the guide hole and recites a conical shaped guide hole located in the outer wall structure that damps radial and/or axial movement of the housing by reducing structural rigidity of the housing. Using a conical shaped guide hole is not a matter of mere design choice but advantageously enhances structural damping by causing the bolt to rub against the narrowing guide hole thereby damping movements of the housing by friction (see e.g. Applicant's specification page 8 line 32 to page 9 line 10). In view of the foregoing remarks regarding claim 51, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 51 is patentable and respectfully request allowance of this claim.

New Dependent Claims 46 - 49:

New dependent claims 46 - 49 further define the scope of the invention, as described in the specification and drawings. For example, claim 46 teaches the cooling air inlets are sized and configured to reduce impingement cooling and enhance convective cooling. Claim 47 further details this arrangement wherein the axial length of the cooling air inlet orifices is less than 50% of the total axial length of the housing. In connection with Examiner's section 103 argument, Examiner asserts that Alkabie (EP 0896193A2) teaches a cooling air orifice opening into a cooling air channel. Alkabie teaches inlet ports opening into a cooling air channel such

Serial No. 10/694,192**Atty. Doc. No. 2000P20254WOUS**

that the inlet ports are provided in an area representing substantially the whole axial and circumferential extent of the transition zone (see e.g. Alkabie specification column 4 lines 10 – 23). Thus, if Alkabie provides any teaching regarding the axial length of the cooling air inlet orifice, it teaches that such length should be maximized, if not coexistence entire housing length.


CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/23/06

By: _____


John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830